	Case 1:16-cr-10289-DPW Document 39 Filed 07/31/17 Page 1 of 31	1
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
	DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS	
2		
3 4	UNITES STATES OF AMERICA)	
5	ONTIES STATES OF AMERICA)	
6	vs.) 1:16-cr-10289-DPW	
)	
7	KYLE P. NATHAN,)	
8	Defendant.)	
9		
10	BEFORE: THE HONORABLE DOUGLAS P. WOODLOCK	
11		
12	SENTENCING HEARING	
13		
14		
15	John Joseph Moakley United States Courthouse Courtroom No. 1	
16	One Courthouse Way Boston, MA 02210	
17	Wednesday, July 12, 2017 3:30 p.m.	
18	o oo pumu	
19		
20	Pronds K Hangogk DMD CDD	
21	Brenda K. Hancock, RMR, CRR Official Court Reporter	
22	John Joseph Moakley United States Courthouse One Courthouse Way	
23	Boston, MA 02210 (617)439-3214	
24		
25		
	1	

```
1
               (The following proceedings were held in open court
      before the Honorable Douglas P. Woodlock, United States
 2.
      District Judge, United States District Court, District of
 3
 4
      Massachusetts, at the John J. Moakley United States Courthouse,
 5
      One Courthouse Way, Courtroom 1, Boston, Massachusetts, on
 6
      Wednesday, July 12, 2017)
               THE CLERK: All rise.
 7
           (The Honorable Court entered the courtroom at 3:30 p.m.)
 8
               THE CLERK: This Honorable Court is now in session.
 9
10
      You may be seated. Criminal Action Number 16-10289, United
11
      States v. Kyle Nathan.
               THE COURT: Well, I have the defendant's Sentencing
12
13
      Memorandum with attached letters, and I have the Presentence
14
      Report.
               Is there any other written material I should have?
15
               MR. SHINE: There's nothing from the Government, sir.
16
               MR. LAUER: Nor from the defense.
               THE COURT: And in reviewing the Presentence Report --
17
18
      which I quess, Mr. Lauer, you have discussed fully with your
19
      client.
20
               MR. LAUER: Yes, your Honor.
21
               THE COURT: Apart from a couple of modest matters,
22
      there does not appear to be anything in dispute. That is to
      say, the Total Offense Level will be 23, the Criminal History
23
24
      Category will be II, the guideline provisions would be
      51 months' to 63 months' incarceration, supervised release of 1
25
```

2.

to 3 years, a fine of \$20,000 to \$200,000, restitution of \$19,480, and Special Assessment on I guess each of the four counts of \$100, so a total of \$400.

MR. LAUER: We are in agreement with everything provided in the Presentence Report, with the caveat that the final restitution amount may differ slightly, and that's something that Mr. Shine and I are in consultation about.

MR. SHINE: It appears that one of the banks a lot of money was recovered. It was dye-stained. So, what I thought I would ask you to do is withhold any judgment on restitution, two weeks and I will confirm that, and we will file a joint memo, agreed joint memo, with the restitution number for the Court. I thought that would be fair.

THE COURT: All right. Fine.

MR. LAUER: And that's agreeable.

THE COURT: All right. So, Mr. Shine, let me hear from you about the Government's recommendation.

MR. SHINE: Your Honor, this started as a very troubling case, but I think it is going to have a reasonable resolution.

In 2015 to 2016 a series of banks in the Greater
Boston Area were robbed, 10, 12, maybe even up to 14 banks. At
this point the FBI had identified, they felt, two individuals
who might be involved in the robbery. One is a gentleman by
the name of James Sarno, who is significantly older than the

2.

other individual, who is the defendant here before you,
Mr. Kyle Nathan. So, there were bits and pieces, nothing
concrete on all of them, just small bits and pieces around, but
we felt they were all done the same way, the manner and method,
presence of a car, there were never any bombs, there were never
any weapons showed, they were all note jobs. So, we pretty
much included that these individuals were involved in the
robberies, and the majority of those being the other
individual. We thought that maybe Mr. Nathan was in concert
with him, but we had no concrete proof.

However, then on March 18th of 2016 a Citizens Bank, which is contained within a Stop & Shop Supermarket in Chelmsford, was robbed by this gentleman, Mr. Nathan. He was arrested a very short period of time later. Mr. Sarno, who had not entered the bank, was arrested at a remote location at a different time.

We provided initial discovery on this case, and Mr. Lauer and myself spoke about the other cases, and I provided him what I felt would be the best evidence I would have on the other robberies. Mr. Nathan came to the table almost immediately and indicated a willingness to resolve those open matters.

As to the other robberies, we were ready to charge

Mr. Sarno. He, however, stayed in state court and pled guilty

and received a sentence. I think there were ten banks he ended

2.

up being charged with in the state court and received a sentence of 7 to 10 years' imprisonment. He had a different record, and the Government felt that was a reasonable resolution of his end of the matter, and so we chose not to charge him and just have Mr. Nathan here.

Mr. Nathan does not have an extensive record, but the record clearly shows a problem, continuing problem, with drugs and, in particular, I believe heroin, which caused a lot of this situation.

He has prior convictions for possession of heroin and some other arrests for heroin, so he has had some criminal history. His criminal history is not that great, but I wanted to give you a framework of why the Government even started looking at this, and then Mr. Nathan came. As a result of that, the Government believes that the *Guidelines* are appropriate in this matter, and, as I indicated during any negotiations, that I would be recommending the low end of the *Guidelines* as found.

So, I think a period of 51 months' imprisonment is an appropriate number. It is a little over 4 years. With credit for time served, he will probably be out in 3 years and some change. I would also ask for a period of 3 years of supervised release.

This is not the same man I looked at when I arraigned him last year about this time. He has improved his health, he

looks great, and I understand through Mr. Lauer that he's been really doing well and going in the right direction.

THE COURT: What do I do about Paragraph 4 of the Presentence Report, which reports records of disciplinary actions, disciplinary reports, numerous disciplinary reports for actions such as use of obscene, abusive and insolent manner or language or gesture, conduct which disrupts the normal operation of the facility or unit, refusing a direct order by staff, and making or introducing or transferring intoxicants? And he has received apparently some punishments, including loss of telephone and loss of canteen.

MR. SHINE: Yes, it cannot be overlooked. I think that was the Kyle Nathan that walked into prison a year ago still with the taste for drugs and still with the attitude, and he had that attitude, and I think that's changed. I have not been able to update if there is anything new. I imagine if there was there would be something happening.

In my opinion, this is not the same guy that walked in. Paragraph 4 was the guy that we arrested and charged. This is not the same guy. That's why I think the sentence is reasonable. I also want a period of 3 years of supervised release and for him to be asked and to be made available for different programs. We could provide him with R.I.S.E. and then the Restart Program when he gets out to, you know, give him a soft landing place. The expectation is when he gets out

2.

I will still be here and you will still be here, and I don't want to see him again, and I think if we set -- structure this in such a way, we can prevent that from happening.

So, I think 51 months is the low end of the advisory guidelines, a period of supervised release for 3 years. The restitution, it's going to be 17- to \$19,000, give or take. That will be determined within two weeks. The mandatory Special Assessment is \$400, which has to be paid. He has no assets that I'm aware of. The pretrial did not have any assets, so that no fine would be appropriate. And then forfeiture as stated in the Indictment. I think there's just some minor -- some clothing and things along those lines.

I think that's a fair number. I think this young man is going in the right direction, and I'm happy to make the recommendation. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Let me just ask Probation, with respect to the disciplinary proceedings in Cedar Junction, what is the date?

THE PROBATION OFFICER: Your Honor, I'm actually flipping through those disciplinary reports right now and just trying to get a general range of the dates of offenses. I believe I'm looking at one here from November of 2016, February of 2017, October of 2016, October of 2016. From what I can see here, it runs from approximately October of 2016 to approximately February of 2017, just looking quickly.

1 THE COURT: These are at the time that he has first been incarcerated? 2. THE PROBATION OFFICER: I believe he was incarcerated 3 originally in March of 2016, so it would have been 4 5 approximately seven months after the arrest. 6 THE COURT: Okay. Anything in 2017? 7 THE PROBATION OFFICER: I believe the latest or the most recent --8 MR. SHINE: 9 February. 10 THE PROBATION OFFICER: -- that I can see would be 11 February of 2017. THE COURT: What was it? 12 13 THE PROBATION OFFICER: I would have to look. 14 MR. SHINE: I guess, while we are going through it, he 15 was arrested on my matter in August of '16, and then he was --16 THE COURT: But he was in state custody at that point? 17 Yes. And then, when he was sent over, MR. SHINE: which would have been, he wasn't indicted until October, so 18 19 those offenses, not all of them, there was one, to be perfectly 20 candid on that, but the majority of those offenses occurred 21 within I'd say a month or so of the Indictment coming down. 22 And then the Superseding Information wasn't filed until earlier 23 this year, but negotiation was ongoing. And I will be very 24 candid, it wasn't he was dragging his feet. It was just 25 getting everything together. He expressed a willingness to

resolve the cases.

THE COURT: As to the 2017, February 2017 matter?

THE PROBATION OFFICER: Yes, your Honor. In regards

to the February 10th, 2017 offense there are three offenses --

5 excuse me -- multiple offenses listed: Refusing a direct order

6 by any staff member, attempting to commit any of the above

7 offenses --

1

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: I'm sorry. I'm not hearing you, so maybe if you can speak into the --

THE PROBATION OFFICER: Sorry, your Honor.

11 Absolutely.

The offenses noted for the February 10th, 2017 report note: Offense One, refusing a direct order by any staff member; two, attempting to commit any of the above offenses, making plans to commit any of the above offenses, or aiding another person to commit any of the above offenses shall be considered the same as the commission of the offense above.

THE COURT: I can't see what is above.

THE PROBATION OFFICER: It's refusing a direct order by any staff members, the one noted above it.

The third violation, he was violating any department rule or regulation or any other rule, regulation or condition of an institution or community-based program; Offense Number Four listed as failure to comply with standing count procedures; and Offense Number Five listed is attempting to

2.

commit any of the above offenses. It's a duplicate of the second offense.

THE COURT: What is the underlying nature of this, refusing a count?

THE PROBATION OFFICER: The quick description of the offense is, "On February 10th at approximately 22:00 hours this correction officer was conducting a major count in Block 4

Housing Unit. At that time inmate Kyle Nathan" -- excuse me -"Nathan, Kyle refused to stand for count. Inmate laid down on his bed, refusing to stand, and only lifted his head and said,
'I just did.' I continued on with my count. All appropriate authorities were notified, and then Nathan was placed on Double A status." That was the brief stipulation of the offense.

THE COURT: All right. Okay. Mr. Lauer.

MR. LAUER: I can probably begin by stating the obvious, that the driving factor in the conduct before the Court is substance abuse, and for someone of his age I think, at least in my experience, the extent and the entrenched nature of his drug problem is very concerning. It is detailed in the PSR, but in many ways it is a cautionary tale.

Mr. Nathan is someone who came from a solid background. He was well provided for in his childhood. There were some things that happened that were not the easiest to deal with, but he had caring parents. He still has carrying

parents. He has family members, friends, people who are supportive figures in his life, many of whom are here today seated in the gallery. And what is described in the Presentence Report and what is described in the letters that were submitted is someone who drifted away in many ways, someone whose drug abuse began at a young age, perhaps as experimentation or dabbling, grew steadily worse, and at the time of the commission of these offenses was really beyond his ability to control. This is a gentleman who was essentially homeless, desperate, going from high to high and burning through massive amounts of drugs, particularly heroin and opiates.

And so, I think in some ways what we see manifested here is really some of the worst fears about where drug abuse can take a person. Mr. Nathan is not here to make excuses for himself. He made the choices to put those substances in his body, and he is going to have to live with the consequences of those choices.

But what I can tell the Court and put in some context is that this is a person who does have a number of positive things in his life, and he will have those positive things in his life at the conclusion of whatever sentence the Court imposes. He has the benefit of a high school education, he has the benefit of work experience, and he managed to do those things even while in the midst of a very serious drug problem.

2.

When he is released he intends to avail himself of whatever drug treatment he can. I should mention for the Court that, while Mr. Nathan's drug problem was raging, he on a number of occasions did take steps to try and address it on his own. He checked himself into rehab I think five times and had difficulty making the next step into a longer-term treatment facility. Some of that was due to his own choices, but some of that was also due to the limitations having to do with his family's financial situation and their insurance.

So, Mr. Nathan is 24 years old. He will be 25 in two weeks. He has been in custody for 17 months. He needs drug treatment. That is the single-most overriding factor in whether he will recidivate or not. We are asking the Court to make a judicial recommendation that he be permitted to participate in the Residential Drug Abuse Program.

THE COURT: Well, your recommendation is essentially for 19 more months of incarceration. If I were to make the recommendation to the Bureau of Prisons it would not be -- it's always a recommendation, but it would not be at the top of the list, I guess, at least as I understand what the Bureau of Prisons does with the Residential Drug Treatment Program. They want a longer period of time in prison, in part because one of the benefits, collateral benefits, but benefits of the Residential Drug Treatment Program is earlier release. Not that I would send somebody away to prison so that they get drug

treatment, that is not the purpose of prison, but it is a recognition of what the prison has to offer here or what is available to a defendant here, and so there is a kind of Catch 22, I guess, in the recommendation.

MR. LAUER: Well, what I can tell the Court, I don't know that there's any way to predict with certainty what will happen to him in BOP. His history strongly suggests that he would benefit from that program.

THE COURT: Yes.

2.

MR. LAUER: He intends to avail himself of that program, if afforded the opportunity to do so. But regardless of for administrative reasons or whatever reasons, if that is not feasible, it is certainly feasible for him to be placed on very strict supervision and very strict monitoring once he is placed on supervised release. And I think the Court would be appropriately considering what conditions might accomplish that, once he is placed on supervised release.

We are proposing that Mr. Nathan be placed on supervised release, that he be subjected to drug treatment and monitoring, and that he pursue, if it's determined that he is an appropriate candidate, the C.A.R.E. Program. I think all of those things are appropriately raised by his history.

I would join in Mr. Shine's characterization of Mr. Nathan's appearance being markedly different today than it was one year ago. I understand the Court's concern with

2.

respect to Paragraph 4. He is at MCI-Walpole. Unlike many other detainees, MCI-Walpole is a Maximum Security State Prison. It is not an easy environment. And on more than one occasion when I have attempted to visit Mr. Nathan, I have been unable to do so because the facility has been completely shut down due to some sort of security incident.

THE COURT: What is the reason he is in Cedar Junction?

MR. LAUER: That was a determination made by the Marshal's Office. I don't know why.

THE COURT: Right. But, generally, it is an adjacency or association kind of issue.

MR. SHINE: There is no rhyme or reason to it.

THE COURT: It is just it had available beds for someone who --

MR. SHINE: They had available beds, and they would send them there. He was 23 years old being sent to MCI. We would have anticipated he would have been at Wyatt or at -- but then remember, too, about six months or a year ago there was a shuffling of the deck with Wyatt and Plymouth.

THE COURT: All right. Okay.

MR. SHINE: I don't mean to interrupt, but there were no reasons he had to go there, there were no specific violent reasons or record reasons, because he had a minor record.

There was nothing he was going to do there other than --

THE COURT: Or associational reasons?

2.

MR. SHINE: No, nothing like that at all. And the other individual was, actually, he was sent to State Prison, so he would have ended up at MCI, the potential co-defendant would have ended up at MCI himself, but he was being held in Middleton while his cases were pending.

MR. LAUER: So, I would just ask the Court to take into consideration the environment that he was in and the fact that it seems as if many of the disciplinary reports that were generated occurred earlier in his period of incarceration, as opposed to recently, and on the scale of punishment that inmates can expect to receive the loss of telephone and loss of canteen are of the more benign nature as opposed to others.

But the defendant who sits before you today is not the defendant who walked into court approximately one year ago. He has been trying to use his time productively. He physically appears different, he mentally is, frankly, more coherent, and I think that's something that a number of his family members and friends have noted in their own dealings with him. I think he has come to terms with the fact that there is a consequence that is going to be meted out, but he is a young man, and he intends to avail himself of whatever resources he can to make sure that he does not find himself before this Court again.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Mr. Nathan, I will hear from you, if there is

something that you would like to say.

2.

THE DEFENDANT: Thank you for allowing me to address the Court.

My addiction has played a major role in my decisions leading up to the present situation. I am grateful to still be alive and would like to take this opportunity to thank those who have supported me through all difficult times. My family has suffered tremendously as a result of my behavior.

I stand here ready to accept full responsibility for my mistakes and start my life over again with a new perspective and the wisdom of my past experience to lead me down the path of success. I am eager to prove to everyone here that I will not be another statistic, that I can be a productive member of society, that I will not let the skeletons of my past dictate my future.

My sincere apologies to all whom prosecuted, investigated and were inconvenienced by my crimes, especially the victims I have hurt by my actions.

I would like to thank everyone for their time today. Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Nathan, you don't have to answer this, and your counsel may counsel in a particular way, but I focused on these violations. Mr. Shine was very candid in saying the bulk of them were in October, right around the time you were formally charged here, effectively charged here, and then there

was the one in February. What was going on?

MR. LAUER: Can I have a moment, your Honor?

THE COURT: Sure.

2.

(Atty. Lauer conferred with the defendant off the record)

THE DEFENDANT: Honestly, your Honor, just a tough place to be, and I had to do this all on my own. So, you know, I'm trying to stay, like, sober best I can and, you know, I was doing a lot of drugs, so my mind -- it took me a long period of time to get my mind back on track, you know.

THE COURT: So, let's take February. That is ten months after you started custody. How come you got into a hassle then? What was it? I asked and I heard that it was a count problem but that you were a little bit of a smarty pants.

THE DEFENDANT: The prison system also -- I could have stood for count. Honestly, your Honor, I don't remember the incident, or else I would accept responsibility, but I could have stand for count, and it could be just that the CO does not like me, you know, to be honest. But if that's what it says, then I must have not stood for count, and I guess I accept responsibility for that.

THE COURT: You understand that in these circumstances, that is, facing not just further incarceration but also supervised release, that you cannot be willful, let's put it that way. Things that other people might view as being hassled are things that you have to accept. There is a reason

2.

for it. The reason is to provide a structured way of addressing your problems, even if it seems like a hassle or getting a rough time from a CO who doesn't like you. That is where you are. You understand?

THE DEFENDANT: I'm learning every day something new, that there's consequences to all of my actions, like that day I never thought that it would come up now in court. I probably would have thought otherwise if I understood that.

THE COURT: Well, it did and it will if you find yourself on supervised release. It is not to say the Probation Office does the same thing, they do not, but things that may be viewed by other people as being kind of, "Why are they making a big deal about a count," or something like that are important for purposes of supervised release to make sure that somebody is paying attention to rules and trying to comply with them, even if they are minor rules or technical rules.

And that is why I asked the question, because you are going to have to deal with that in the future.

THE DEFENDANT: For what it's worth, I'm trying to stay out of trouble now and I'm just trying to stay positive through this whole thing, and it hasn't been an easy road the past 16 months being in prison, coming off all that drugs with no medication and no help whatsoever. I had to do it all on my own. I'm learning as I go, I guess I would say, you know, I'm figuring things out trial and error. I feel like I have my

head back on straight, and I'm trying to stay out of trouble, even in prison.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

THE DEFENDANT: Thank you.

2.

THE COURT: So, the issues are these, it seems to me: We have a set of *Guidelines*. The *Guidelines* in this area actually are at least empirically better, I think, than in other areas, empirically in the sense that this kind of crime has generated a fairly consistent kind of approach by judges. It is, to address the considerations of Section 3553, a serious offense. Bank robbery at one time was the serious offense in the Federal Courts. There are other offenses now that have taken center stage, but it used to be the meat and potatoes of violent crime or core crime in the Federal Courts.

Now, this is different. It is not, as Mr. Shine pointed out, a case involving the threat of violence, unless you could say implicit in offering a note is a threat of violence, but it is a serious matter, and it is one that I think bears some emphasis. Who is the victim here? Well, of course, the banking system. But something more. The people you give that note to, without using stereotypes, are generally young women who are in their first job and are scared to death when that happens and live afterwards with a sense of fear. That is something that the Courts have generally taken into consideration, and I do as well.

2.

Now, I don't have any victims before me here, but I have a template, and the template is this: that you were going into a setting where there were vulnerable victims in the larger sense, people at the beginning of their work life who one would suspect, even in the absence of a gun or a threat, a direct threat, would feel that their life has just been moved in a horrible direction. So, it is a serious offense.

Then I look at the nature and characteristics of you as an offender. We have all talked about your drug problem. You recognize it. You are to be credited for saying that you have tried to deal with it yourself, because ultimately whatever programs we have depend on whether or not you can do it. I don't have to give you the Twelve-Step Program, except to say what they always say in the Twelve-Step Program: you wake up every morning and you are still an addict. Every day you have to deal with that. But it sounds to me that you are.

I read these letters from people who know you, and they were candid letters, I thought, recognizing your shortcomings but also your possibilities. Those are things that should be credited as well in sentencing. That is what Section 3553 does.

I then look at the question of individual deterrence. What that means is what do we need to keep you from doing this again? The overarching principle of sentencing is that the sentence should be sufficient but no more than necessary to

2.

serve the larger purposes of the considerations under Section 3553, which I have talked about, the seriousness of the offense, the idea of vindicating a public right to be free from that kind of offense, dealing with you as an individual or recognizing your background, but the question of individual deterrence is an important one.

I am of the view, but this is a bet, it is not a certainty, I am of the view that this is not something you are going to get yourself involved in again immediately or at all, but there is that potential.

But then I look at it from a broader perspective, that is, general deterrence, the other Kyle Nathans out there who find themselves slipping into and captured by drugs. What does it say to them if a sentence is at one end or the other? It is possible to over-deter, it is possible to say it will not be much of a problem if people understand that you get 20 years for doing something like that. That is not what I am intending to do. On the other hand, that has to say to them there are serious consequences for this kind of activity, whether or not you are in the grips of demons like drugs or not. So, that's another factor. I know what the going rate is or have seen the going rate over an extended period of time for bank robbery like this, and it is a heavier sentence than ordinarily you would see in encounters like the encounters you had.

Then I look at the question of what does prison do? I

2.

asked in my discussion with Mr. Lauer what does that mean for a Residential Drug Treatment Program. Again, I am not sending you to prison or would not send you to prison to give you a drug treatment program that generally is pretty effective, the Residential Drug Treatment Program. On the other hand, I am thinking about it, thinking about it in the sense of this is part of the mix of what the proper sentence should be. If I thought that prison would be absolutely deleterious, bad for you, I would think about it differently, I suppose. But prison is not a good thing, and being in Cedar Junction is no walk in the park. The Federal Bureau of Prisons has a somewhat different range of alternatives. So, I have thought about that a bit. I do think that the Residential Drug Treatment Program would be useful for you.

And then I come to the bottom line. It is why we have Sentencing Guidelines. I don't follow them slavishly. But the reason that we have Sentencing Guidelines is that there is a danger of unwarranted disparity; that is, that somebody walks into or is brought into one judge's court and gets a sentence, let's say it's very low, let's say it's 18 months, and then goes into the next courtroom, or someone very much like him goes into the next courtroom and they get a sentence of 87 months. It is corrosive to the criminal justice system to have something like that, the idea that there is an arbitrariness or caprice in the imposition of sentences. And

so, the *Guidelines* were established as a way of trying to reduce that unwarranted disparity.

I started with the proposition that these *Guidelines*, that is, the *Guidelines* for bank robbery like this, seem to me to be pretty well grounded in terms of what judges have done in the last 50 years in these kinds of cases, and so I have to consider that.

Now, I have talked about all of those separate considerations as if they had a common theme. They do in the sense that you have to consider them, but they pull in different ways. If I am right in my guess that you do not have to spend too much more time in prison to keep you from doing this, that is, we do not have to warehouse you, that pulls in one direction. If, on the other hand, we say, well, there are ranges of sentence that would not be disparate, that in this case falls in a different way. So, I have to balance all of those -- "balance" is the wrong word -- accommodate them, because they cannot be balanced.

My own view is that this is a serious offense. You have a responsibility for that serious offense. A serious sentence, incarcerative sentence, is necessary. It is also my view that it does not have to be as long as the guideline provides.

So, I am going to impose a sentence of 42 months' incarceration here. That also, incidentally, coincidently,

provides the opportunity for the Residential Drug Treatment

Program, at least a greater opportunity that would be more

likely than you just getting pushed out of it because there are

people who are going to be there longer. I will, in any event,

make a recommendation that you participate in whatever drug

treatment programs are available in the prison system.

More than that, I am going to recommend that you take advantage of the opportunities that the prison system has for educational and vocational training. It is the case that you worked and could work. It is the case that you have got innate intelligence. You have got to take advantage of those kinds of things as well. Again, this is not to provide you job training or the criminal justice equivalent of junior college, but it is to say there are opportunities, if you take advantage of them, in the prison system that are meaningful for you.

I cannot, in fairness, I think, impose a sentence lower than that, and I'm sorry that I don't think I can, because it seems to me that the report that Mr. Shine makes, that Mr. Lauer makes, that you yourself make about your ability to take control of your life after a life that was in some ways out of your control because of your drug addiction is something to be honored and valued, and I do here, but you are going to have to keep doing it.

Now, I am not going to impose a sentence that involves some kind of financial responsibility, except for the

2.

restitution, and we will get to that, and the parties will provide me with that. You took money, and it wasn't yours, it belongs to somebody else, and you have got to give it back.

There is a Special Assessment. It comes to \$400. It will be paid according to a prison-responsibility program as well.

But the more meaningful thing for me -- and I have to do this for society, that is to say, society has a claim on you because you did something to society, and that is vindicated through the sentence itself -- but what is important to me is rehabilitation; that is, you get out, you get a job, you keep clean, and you become a productive member of society. The people who have spent a lot of time supporting you and continue to believe in you would feel their efforts had been validated. We are all better off if you are a productive member of society. We are all not so well off if you are not. But the person who is really not well off is you. So, we are trying to get you to function in a way that would serve society by serving yourself. That means, as far as I am concerned,

I talked about, made a comparison between, supervised release and being in prison. It is not the same thing. The Probation Office of this court is very, very capable of being supportive -- it is tough love -- but being supportive of people who are moving back into society, and you will find that

2.

to be the case. You should take advantage of that, take advantage of what they are going to do.

It has been suggested to me that the C.A.R.E. Program is an appropriate one. I think that is probably right, and I will make a recommendation. But you have to be invested in it as well. It is another one of these you have got to work hard at it. You get immediate feedback if you do something wrong. On the other hand, it's a program that's useful for people who have had addictions like you, and so I am going to make that recommendation.

The terms and conditions of supervised release are the customary ones, they are mandatory ones, that you don't commit another federal, state or local crime, that you not possess any controlled substance, that you refrain from any unlawful use of a controlled substance, and in your case I am going to require that there be drug testing, as many as 104 drug tests per year, as probation sees necessary. It is necessary for you to provide DNA to the Probation Office as well.

There are standard conditions, you will see them in the Judgment and Commitment Order, and you are, no doubt, familiar with them as well, but I will make special conditions that have to do with your situation. First, you are prohibited from drinking alcohol to the point of intoxication. I will define that the way Massachusetts does, which is a .10 blood alcohol level. I am not saying no alcohol, but I am saying you

2.

can't be drunk and you can't really at .10 be too high. You have to submit to substance abuse -- I say "submit" -- "participate" is a better word -- in substance abuse programs that are developed by the Probation Office. That is part of the drug-testing process. It is an effort to get you into a setting in which you understand the seriousness of what you are doing and are getting support, maybe support by other people, dealing with other people, trying to help other people who have had the problems that you have.

I am going to permit the Probation Office also to consider cognitive behavioral treatment programs more broadly to deal with this. All of this is to be tailored to your special circumstance at the time that you're out and during the period of supervised release.

You are going to be required to pay the balance of restitution, if you haven't paid it by then, or any financial contribution according to a Court-ordered schedule, if you have not paid at that time.

And so long as you have outstanding financial obligations, you are going to be required to provide the Probation Office with access to any financial information they ask for, and you should understand that that information will be made available to the Financial Litigation Unit of the United States Attorney's Office.

You are prohibited from incurring any new credit

charges or opening additional lines of credit without the approval of the Probation Office while you are subject to these financial obligations.

And to the degree that in any of these programs there is available either directly from you, that is, you have the ability to contribute to it, or there is third-party payment through some sort of insurance or other mechanism, you are going to be required to contribute to these programs. These are not free benefits, unless you are indigent, and the idea of having people contribute is to make clear you do cause costs to society more generally, and you have got to contribute to it.

All of this is designed to reinforce and support you. It works if you work at it. It will be a shame if you do not. But for all of those reasons I am imposing the sentence that I have indicated.

Now, are there any additional points that the parties or Probation would ask me to add to it?

MR. SHINE: No. We will determine for this Court, and we will file a joint memorandum within two weeks, of the restitution figure.

THE COURT: Right, right.

MR. SHINE: Other than that, everything is spot on.

MR. LAUER: Nothing further.

THE COURT: Anything from Probation?

THE PROBATION OFFICER: Nothing.

2.

```
THE COURT: You should understand that in this
 1
 2
      session, Mr. Nathan, you do have a right of appeal, and you
 3
      will want to discuss with your attorney whether that makes any
 4
      sense under these circumstances. All right?
 5
               THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, your Honor.
 6
               THE COURT: I didn't mean to lecture you, but of
      course I did, but it is up to you. Everybody here is betting
 7
 8
      on you. Bet on yourself, okay?
 9
               THE DEFENDANT: Okay, I will. Thank you.
               THE COURT: Good luck.
10
11
               MR. SHINE: Thank you, your Honor.
12
               THE COURT: Thank you.
               THE CLERK: All rise.
13
14
             (The Honorable Court exited the courtroom at 4:15 p.m.)
15
               (WHEREUPON, the proceedings adjourned at 4:15 p.m.)
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATE I, Brenda K. Hancock, RMR, CRR and Official Court Reporter of the United States District Court, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript constitutes, to the best of my skill and ability, a true and accurate transcription of my stenotype notes taken in the matter of *United States of America* v. Kyle Nathan, No. 1:16-cr-10289-DPW Date: 7/29/17 /s/ Brenda K. Hancock Brenda K. Hancock, RMR, CRR Official Court Reporter